preprint - UTF 363

gr-qc/9510016

arXiv:gr-qc/9510016v1 10 Oct 1995

Hessling's Quantum Equivalence Principle and the Temperature of an Extremal Reissner-Nordström Black Hole

Valter Moretti [1]

Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Trento
and Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare,
Gruppo Collegato di Trento,
38050 Povo (TN) Italia

October 1995

Abstract:

The Hessling improvement of the Haag, Narnhofer and Stein principle is analysed in the case of a massless scalar field propagating outside of an extremal R-N black hole. It is found that this sort of "Quantum (Einstein's) Equivalence Principle" selects only the R-N vacuum as a physically sensible state, i.e., it selects the temperature $T = 0$ only.

PACS number(s): 04.62.+v, 04.70.Dy, 11.10.Wx

In this note we would like to report some results obtained employing the Hessling principle (see below) in order to select the physically sensible KMS states of a massless scalar field propagating outside of an extremal R-N black hole. Explicit calculations and more extended discussions will appear in the changed and final version of ref. [1].

To begin with, we recall that Haag, Narnhofer and Stein in [2] proved that if one assumes fairly standard axioms of quantum (quasi-free) field theory, particularly *local definiteness* and *local stability* in an at least stationary, causally complete space-time region, the thermal Wightman functions in the *interior* of this region will transform into *non thermal* and *massless* Wightman functions in the Minkowski space-time when the geodesic distance of the arguments is vanishing.
We called [1] this statement, which from a naive point of view seems to follow from the Einstein equivalence principle, the HNS *theorem*. It is important to stress that the

[1] e-mail: *moretti@science.unitn.it, moretti@itncisca.bitnet, 37953::moretti*

statement above is valid also in the case $T = 0$.
For example, in case of two-point thermal Wightman functions of a scalar field it holds:

$$\lambda^2 W^{\pm}_{\beta}(x + \lambda z_1, x + \lambda z_2) \to \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \frac{1}{g_{\mu\nu}(x) z^\mu z^\nu} \quad \text{as} \quad \lambda \to 0^+ \,, \tag{1}$$

where $z = z_2 - z_1$. In the equation above the coordinates $x \equiv x^\mu$ indicate a point in the *interior* of the region,

$$z_{(j)} \equiv z^\mu_{(j)} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \mid_x$$

indicates vectors in the *tangent space* at x and finally we used the obvious notation:

$$x + z_{(j)} \equiv x^\mu + z^\mu_{(j)} \,.$$

We stress that both sides of Eq.(1) are *distributions* acting on a couple of smooth test functions in the corresponding variables z_1 and z_2.
Conversely, the Haag, Narnhofer and Stein *principle* [2] generalises the HNS theorem and it affirms that in the case the space-time region we are dealing with is just *a part* of the whole manifold separated by *event horizons*, the point coincidence behaviour of the Wightman functions for a physically sensible (thermal *or not*) state must hold also *onto the horizons*.
Haag, Narnhofer and Stein proved in [2] that in the case of Rindler and Schwarzschild space-times, this constraint holds *only* for $\beta_T = 1/T_{U,H}$, where T_U and T_H are the *Unruh* and *Hawking temperatures*.
Eq. (1) implies:

$$\lambda^2 W^{\pm}_{\beta}(x, x + \lambda z) \to \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \frac{1}{g_{\mu\nu}(x) z^\mu z^\nu} \quad \text{as} \quad \lambda \to 0^+ \,, \tag{2}$$

where x is a point on the horizon. Following the original paper of Haag Narnhofer and Stein, we interpreted Eq. (1) in [1] in this weaker sense and thus we evaluated the limit in Eq. (2) for *real* vectors z, space-like or time-like; for light-like vectors we expected a divergent limit.
In order to use the (weak) HNS principle for two-point Wightman functions one has to check their behaviour as one point is fixed on the horizon and the other is running toward the first from the inside of the considered region. This is not as simple as one might think at first, because the metric could become degenerated on the horizon in the stationary coordinates which define the studied thermal Wightman functions, consequently it could not be possible to write down the right hand side of Eq. (2) in that coordinate frame. However, as pointed by Haag, Narnhofer and Stein in [2], one can check the validity of the HNS principle in stationary coordinates using directly Eq. (2) for specific points on the horizons, i.e., for those which belong to the intersection of the past and the future horizons, and along appropriate directions (along the space-like geodesics), but not on the whole horizon. The check of the behaviour of Wightman functions in these "few" points is sufficient to determine the Unruh and the Hawking temperatures respectively in the case of the Rindler wedge and the Schwarzschild background. Hessling proved in [3] that the HNS principle, in the case of the Rindler wedge, determines the Unruh temperature only when it works on the intersection of the horizons, but it does not determine any temperature by considering the remaining points. In [1] we reported an independent

proof of this fact.
Unfortunately in the case of an extremal Reissner-Nordström black hole the past and the future horizons *do not intersect* (see [1] and references therein) and furthermore it is not possible to deal with the original procedure of Haag, Narnhofer and Stein because in this case some important technical hypothesis does not hold, e.g., the requirement of a *non-vanishing surface gravity* or related parameters [2].
In such a situation the Hessling development of the HNS principle results to be very useful because, in the Minkowski space-time at least, it determines the Unruh temperature working also considering the points which do not belong to the intersection of horizons [3]. In [1] we reported an independent proof of this fact, too. We expected a similar result in the case of an extremal R-N black hole where the intersection does not exist.
Furthermore [3] one could note that, in a real (Schwarzschild) black hole, the *past* event horizon does not exist and thus also the *intersection* of horizons does not exist. For this reason the Hessling principle result to be very important as far as the possibility to use this in more physical situations than the *eternal* black hole cases is concerned.
Hessling's principle, trying to define a *Quantum (Einstein) Equivalence Principle* to be imposed on the physically sensible quantum states [3][2], requires the *existence* of the limit:

$$\lim_{\lambda \to 0^+} N(\lambda)^2 \, W^{\pm}_{\beta}(x + \lambda z_1, x + \lambda z_2) \, , \tag{3}$$

as a *continuous* function of x, for some function $N(\lambda)$ monotonous and nonnegative for $\lambda > 0$. Furthermore, it requires the validity of a much more strong condition in every *local inertial coordinate system around* x (i.e., a coordinate frame such that $g_{\mu\nu}(x) = diag(-1, 1, 1, 1)$, $\partial_\rho g_{\mu\nu}(x) = 0$):

$$\lim_{\lambda \to 0^+} \frac{d}{d\lambda} \, N(\lambda)^2 W^{\pm}_{\beta}(x + \lambda z_1, x + \lambda z_2) = 0 \, . \tag{4}$$

The latter requirement is connected with the fact that within a local inertial system the metric looks like the Minkowski metric *up to the first order* in the coordinate derivatives. In the Minkowski background and using Minkowskian coordinates Eq.(4), which involves coordinate derivatives up to *the first order*, results to be satisfyed and thus we expect this will hold in curved backgrounds by using local inertial coordinate systems[3], too (see [3] for details). We can note that, away from the horizons, the validity HNS *theorem* implies the validity of the *first* Hessling requirement with $N(\lambda) = \lambda$. Furthermore, the validity of the HNS *principle on a horizon* implies the validity of the *first* Hessling requirement there.
As in the case of the HNS principle, in [1], we used the Hessling principle on an event horizon in a *weaker* version, by checking the validity of Eq.(2) as well as of the following equation:

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda} \lambda^2 W^{\pm}_{\beta}(x, x + \lambda z) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \lambda \to 0^+ \, , \tag{5}$$

where x belongs to the horizon, z is a *real space-like or time-like* vector and a *local inertial coordinate system* is used.

[2]Really, Hessling considers in [3] also *n-point functions*, but we restricted [1] our discussion by considering only the case of a scalar *quasifree* field and thus by studying only the *two-point* functions.

[3]We stress that Hessling generalises the above equations in order to be able to use a *non* local inertial coordinate system [3], too.

It is interesting to check whether the HNS principle and the Hessling principle select special temperatures for thermal states in the case of an extremal Reissner-Nordström black hole (see [1] for a more extended discussion involving other methods, too). It is possible to check the HNS and the Hessling principles by studying the behaviour of two point Wightman functions along every geodesic which starts from the event horizons. We note that for every geodesic which meets the horizon in a point x there is a locally geodesic coordinate frame with the origin at x. Furthermore we can choose the geodesic to be a coordinate axis, the running coordinate being just the length of the geodesic measured from x. By varying the geodesics which meet the horizon one obtains all the possible points of the horizon together with their tangent vectors. We stress that it is possible to execute this checking procedure also by using stationary coordinates, because the geodesic length is invariant and so is not sensitive to the degeneracy of this *representation* of the metric.
Using the above method in the case of the *Rindler wedge* we concluded in [1] that only the points in the *intersection* of horizons really select a temperature of thermal states by the *HNS principle*: the *Unruh temperature* $T_U = 1/\beta = 2\pi$. On the other hand, considering the points on the horizon which do not belong to the intersection of horizons, we obtained in [1] that the *Hessling principle* holds *only if* the temperature is the *Unruh temperature* once again[4]. The same results appear on [3].
In case of a massless scalar field in the 4-dimensional Reissner-Nordström background, the metric we are interested in reads:

$$ds^2 = -\left(1 - \frac{R_H}{R}\right)^2 (dx^0)^2 + \left(1 - \frac{R_H}{R}\right)^{-2} dR^2 + R^2\, d\Omega_2\,, \tag{6}$$

where we used polar coordinates, R being the radial one and $d\Omega_2$ being the metric of the unit-2-sphere. The horizon radius is $R_H = MG = Q$, M being the mass of the black hole, G the Newton constant and Q its charge. It is obvious that any redefinition of *space-like coordinates* does not change the thermal properties of our field theory because these properties depend on the time-like coordinate and in particular on its tangent Killing vector. Thus, as in [5], we redefined the Reissner-Nordström radial coordinate in order to obtain the following approximated form of the metric *near the horizon*, i.e., $r \to +\infty$:

$$ds^2 = \frac{1}{r^2}\left[-dt^2 + dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega_2\right]\,, \tag{7}$$

or

$$ds^2 = \frac{1}{\mathbf{x}^2}\left[-dt^2 + (d\mathbf{x})^2\right]\,, \tag{8}$$

where we used the obvious notation

$$t = x^0\,,$$

$$\mathbf{x} \equiv (x^1, x^2, x^3) \quad , \quad r = |\mathbf{x}|\,.$$

The previous metric is called the *Bertotti-Robinson metric* [6]. Note that this metric is *conformal* to Minkowski metric by the factor $1/r^2$, *singular* at the origin; however we were interested in the region near the horizon, i.e. $r \to +\infty$, and this singularity is absent

[4]We also observed that also the limit case $\beta \to +\infty$ *does not satisfy* the Hessling condition.

there.
In order to perform explicit computations, we considered the large mass limit of the black hole, i.e., $R_H \to +\infty$. In this limit, the whole region outside of the black hole ($R > R_H$) tends to approach the horizon and thus the above approximated metric tends to hold everywhere.
In [1], we calculated the geodesics which reach the past (H^-) or the future (H^-) horizon of the considered metric. We obtained *three* families of geodesics which start from the horizons.
Really, a further family of time constant geodesics which *seem* to reach the intersection of horizons $H^+ \cap H^-$ appeared, too. We stressed in [1] that these geodesics *just seem* to reach the horizons as $s \to \pm\infty$, where s is a Riemannian length calculated from a point away from the horizon, but that is an obvious contradiction; actually, as discussed in [1], this is a consequence of the fact that $H^+ \cap H^- = \emptyset$.
We report on the *first* family only here, a complete description appear in [1].

First family of geodesics which start from the horizons.

$$r = \frac{A}{s}\,, \tag{9}$$

$$t = t_0 \pm \frac{A}{s}\,, \tag{10}$$

$$\phi = s + \phi_0\,, \tag{11}$$

where $A > 0$, t_0, ϕ_0 are real numbers. The origin of the parameter s is chosen in a way that the starting point of the geodesic is on the horizon. This horizon will be H^+ if the sign in front of A in Eq. (10) is $+$, otherwise it will be H^- if the sign is $-$.
All these geodesics are *space-like*.

Furthermore, we calculated the Wightman function for a massless scalar field in the metric (7) and checked the HNS principle as well as the Hessling principle on the horizons. This metric is *conformal* to the Minkowski metric, thus we were able to use the Dowker and Schofield's method [7, 8] which connects the Wightman functions (in general the Green functions) of a scalar field in a static manifold with the corresponding Wightman functions of the field in another, *conformally* related static manifold.
We found [1] the thermal Wightman functions of a massless scalar field (minimally as well as conformally coupled) propagating outside of a large mass, extremal Reissner-Nordström black-hole:

$$W^{\pm}_{\beta} = \frac{\mid \mathbf{x} \mid\mid \mathbf{x}' \mid}{4\pi^2} \frac{\pi \left\{ \coth \frac{\pi}{\beta}(|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}'| + t - t' \mp i\varepsilon) + \coth \frac{\pi}{\beta}(|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}'| - t + t' \pm i\varepsilon) \right\}}{2\beta|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}'|} \tag{12}$$

By taking the limit $\mid \mathbf{x} \mid \to +\infty$ we obtained the thermal Wightman functions calculated on the horizon (in the argument x). In order to to calculate this limit we had to increase (to reach H^+) or decreased (to reach H^-) the variable t together the variable $\mathbf{x}$ and ϕ along the geodesics obtained above. We dealt with H^+ only, because of the time symmetry of the problem.
By considering either the space-like or the time-like geodesics which reach the future

horizons we produced the same function:

$$W_\beta^{\pm}\left(x_{H^+}, x^{'}\right) = \frac{r^{'}\pi\left\{1+\coth\left[\frac{\pi}{\beta}\left(t^{'}-t_0-r^{'}\cos(\phi^{'}-\phi_0)\right)\right]\right\}}{4\pi^2 2\beta} \tag{13}$$

In order to check the HNS principle on H^+ for a space-like vector z tangent to a geodesic of the *first* family in the horizon, we considered Eq. (13) and substituted the variables $r^{'}$, $t^{'}$, $\phi^{'}$ for the functions defined in the right hand side of equations (9), (10), (11), using also the identifications: $t_0 = t_0^{'}$ and $\phi_0 = \phi_0^{'}$. Finally we redefined $s = \lambda z^i$.
We obtained, as $\lambda \to 0$:

$$\lambda^2 W_\beta\left(x_{H^+}, x_{H^+}+\lambda z\right) \sim$$

$$\sim \quad \frac{A\pi\lambda^2}{4\pi^2 2\beta\lambda z^i}\left\{\coth\left[\frac{\pi}{\beta}\left(A\frac{1}{\lambda z^i}-\frac{A\cos\left(\lambda z^i\right)}{\lambda z^i}\right)\right]+1\right\}$$

$$\sim \quad \frac{\lambda^2}{4\pi^2 2 z^i}\frac{z^i}{\frac{1}{2}(\lambda z^i)^2} = \frac{1}{4\pi^2}\frac{1}{g_{\mu\nu}\left(H^+\right)z^\mu z^\nu}\,.$$

We concluded that in that case the HNS principle holds for any value of β. However the remaining two families of geodesics produced the same result (see [1] for explicit calculations).
In [1], we were also able to prove that the same result comes out in the limit case of the R-N vacuum, i.e., $T = 0$.
Finally, we checked the *Hessling principle* in the final version of [1].
Considering the space-like geodesics of the *first family* in Eq.s (9), (10) and (11), it arose by using also Eq.(13):

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda}\,\lambda^2 W_\beta(x_{H^+}, x_{H^+}+\lambda z) = \frac{\Gamma}{\beta}\,\frac{d}{d\lambda}\,\lambda\left\{1+\coth\left[\frac{\pi A}{\beta\lambda z}(1-\cos\lambda z)\right]\right\}\,,$$

where the factor $\Gamma := A/8\pi z$ is *finite* and it does not depend on λ and β.
Some trivial calculations led to:

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda}\,\lambda^2 W_\beta(x_{H^+}, x_{H^+}+\lambda z) = \frac{\Gamma}{\beta}\left\{1+\frac{X+\sinh X\,\cosh X-\frac{\pi A}{\beta z}\sin\lambda z}{\sinh^2 X}\right\}\,,$$

where we also posed:

$$X := \frac{\pi A}{\beta z}\frac{1-\cos\lambda z}{\lambda}\,.$$

Doing the limit as $\lambda \to 0^+$:

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda}\,\lambda^2 W_\beta(x_{H^+}, x_{H^+}+\lambda z) \to \frac{\Gamma}{\beta}\,.$$

This fact was sufficient to prove that the Hessling principle excludes every finite value of β.
The limit case $T = 1/\beta = 0$ survived only. Using the remaining two families of geodesics, the calculations resulted to be very similar and the same limit value of the temperature survived. Furthermore, we proved that the Wightman functions of the R-N vacuum, i.e.,

the limit case $T = 1/\beta = 0$, satisfies the Hessling principle by considering directly the expression of the Wightman functions of the R-N vacuum [1].

The most important conclusion which follows from the calculations in [1] is that *the (weak) HNS principle, in the case of an extreme Reissner-Nordström black hole, holds for every value of β, i.e., it agrees with the method based on the elimination of the singularities of the Euclidean manifold* (see [1] and ref.s therein), *but the Hessling principle selects only the null temperature, i.e., the R-N vacuum as a physical state.*
However, we report some other important remarks.
Another important point is that we dealt with the limit of a large mass black hole and with a massless field, but we think that our conclusions should hold without to assume these strong conditions, too (see the discussion on this in [1]).
Finally, we stress that recently P.H. Anderson, W.A. Hiscock and D.J Loranz [9], by using of the metric (7) and the Brown-Cassidy-Bunch formula (see [9, 4] and references therein) argued (and numerically checked by using the *complete* R-N metric) that the Reissner-Nordström vacuum state is the *only* thermal state with a non-singular *renormalized* stress-tensor on the horizon of an extremal R-N black hole.
We observe that the "improved" *HNS prescription*, i.e. the *Hessling principle* agrees completely with the result of Anderson Hiscock and Loranz, in particular it selects a state carrying a renormalized stress-tensor *finite* on the horizon. This fact comes out also both in the Rindler space where the HNS and Hessling's prescriptions select the Minkowski vacuum which has a regular stress tensor on the horizon or in the Schwarzschild space where the HNS principle selects the Hartle-Hawking state with the same property on the horizon [4].

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank G.Cognola, M.Toller, L.Vanzo and S.Zerbini of the Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università di Trento for all the useful discussions about the topics of this paper.
I am grateful to Bernard Kay and a referee of *Classical and Quantum Gravity* for the article in [1] who pointed out the Hessling paper to me.

References

[1] Moretti V 1995
Wightman Function's Behaviour on the Event Horizon of an Extremal Reissner-Nordström Black Hole, preprint - UTF 350 *hep-th*/9506142 - final version

[2] Haag R, Narnhofer H, Stein U 1984
Commun. Math. Phys. **94** 219

[3] Hessling H 1994
Nuc. Phys. **B 415** 243

[4] Birrel N D and Davies P C W 1982
Quantum Field Theory in Curved Space. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

[5] Cognola G, Vanzo L, Zerbini S 1995
One-loop Quantum Corrections to the Entropy for an Extremal Reissner-Nordström Black-Hole *Univ. Trento preprint* UTF 348, *hep-th*/9504064

[6] Bertotti B 1959
Phys. Rev. **116** 1331,
Robinson I 1959
Bull. Acad. Pol. Sci. **7** 351

[7] Kennedy G, Critchley R C, Dowker J S 1980
Ann. Phys. **125** 346

[8] Dowker J S and Schofield J P 1988
Phys. Rev. D **38** 3327

[9] Anderson P R, Hiscock W A, Loranz D J 1995
Phys. Rev. Lett. **74** 4365, *gr-qc*/9504019